



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,596	10/19/2000	Lily Barkovic Mummert	YOR920000461-US1	8300

7590 10/04/2006
Anne Vachon Dougherty
3173 Cedar Road
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

EXAMINER

TODD, GREGORY G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/692,596

Applicant(s)

MUMMERT ET AL

Examiner

Gregory G. Todd

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to applicant's amendment filed, 13 July 2006, of application filed, with the above serial number, on 19 October 2000 in which claims 1, 5, 10, and 12 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are therefore pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yang et al (hereinafter "Yang", 6,542,854).

As per Claim 1, Yang teaches a method for evaluating workload across a processing environment having a plurality of computer systems each having a plurality of assigned workload units comprising the steps of:

assigning a plurality of impact values, one impact value for each workload unit assigned for each of the plurality of computing systems, wherein said assigning of each impact value comprises determining the change in system expiration date should a

Art Unit: 2157

workload unit be removed from the system (at least col. 5 line 1 - col. 6 line 19; CAE/UFW/CAW using workload definition information for sizing/ cost purposes); and assessing the workload based on said impact values (at least col. 33, lines 30-62; evaluating systems for suitable operation of workload).

As per Claim 2. The method of Claim 1 wherein the change in system expiration date is determined based on system life expectancy (at least col. 5, lines 1-17; col. 6, lines 6-22; col. 7, lines 31-62; workload growth, utilization).

As per Claim 3. The method of Claim 1 wherein the change in system expiration date is determined based on capacity space (at least col. 5, lines 1-17; col. 6, lines 6-22; col. 7, lines 31-62; col. 15, lines 35-54; capacity).

As per Claim 4. The method of Claim 1 further comprising sorting said workload units based on said impact values into a sorted impact list (at least col. 26 line 45 - col. 27 line 5).

As per Claim 5. The method of Claim 1 further comprising altering the workload in the processing environment to change expiration dates of at least two of said plurality of computer systems (at least col. 25, lines 13-20).

As per Claim 6. The method of Claim 1 further comprising comparing the expiration date of each of said plurality of computing systems to at least one target planning date for servicing each of said plurality of computing systems (at least col. 33, lines 30-62).

As per Claim 7. The method of Claim 6 further comprising altering the workload in the processing environment to change the expiration date relative to the target

Art Unit: 2157

planning date for at least two of said plurality of computer systems (at least col. 25, lines 13-20).

As per Claim 8. The method of Claim 6 further comprising the steps of:

creating a From list of computer systems for which the expiration date precedes the at least one planning date;

creating a To list of computer systems for which the expiration date is later than said at least one planning date; and

reassigning workload units from computer systems on said From list to computer systems on said To list based on said impact values (at least col. 6, lines 9-36; transferable workload for capacity planning).

As per Claim 9. The method of Claim 8 further comprising calculating new expiration dates for computer systems on said From and said To lists after said reassigning (at least col. 5 line 1 - col. 6 line 36).

As per Claim 11. The apparatus of Claim 10 further comprising at least one storage location accessible by the administrative processor for storing data relating to said plurality of computer systems (at least Fig. 7).

Claims 10 and 12-20 do not add or define any additional limitations over claims 1-9 and 11 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 17 July 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue, in substance, that Yang fails to teach a) evaluating workload across a processing environment having a plurality of computer systems each having a plurality of assigned workload units; b) assigning a plurality of impact values, one impact value for each workload unit; and c) a system expiration date.

In response to applicant's arguments a), the recitation of evaluating workload across a processing environment having a plurality of computer systems each having a plurality of assigned workload units has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

In response to b) and c):

As the specification defines:

"The impact of a workload unit is the effect on the system's expiration date that results from either adding the workload unit to the system or removing it. The impact is calculated by taking the difference between the expiration date before and after the workload change."

"For the purposes of the present invention, the use of the terms "expiration date", "life expectancy", and "capacity space" will be understood to be mutually-interchangeable alternatives representing measurements of a processing system's capacity." [Page 11]

Yang teaches modeling a workload by determining workload utilization and appropriately sizing and planning a computer activity workload CAW (at least col. 5 line

Art Unit: 2157

1 - col. 6 line 19; col. 3 line 66 - col. 4 line 13; CAE/UFW/CAW using workload definition information for sizing/ cost purposes). Thereby calculating the workload in terms of computing activity elements CAE for a given computing system, where the CAW is represented as CAE/time. Such sizing and capacity planning (expiration date as correlated to Applicant's description) being determined by evaluating the cost of the workload, and thus the effect of the difference (impact) in adding a workload unit versus not adding a workload unit to arrive at the best workload utilization for a given computing system.

In response to Applicant's arguments that Yang does not generally teach the dependent claim features. Examiner maintains that Yang teaches these features as indicated in the above rejections.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2157

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Newly cited Quernemoen, in addition to previously cited Papaefstathiou, Abu Electronic Ata, MacFarlane et al, Chafe, Fong et al, Miller, Hartsell et al, Mummert et al, Flockhart et al, and Sanders et al are cited for disclosing pertinent information related to the claimed invention. Applicants are requested to consider the prior art reference for relevant teachings when responding to this office action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory G. Todd whose telephone number is (571)272-4011. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am-6:00pm w/ first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory Todd



Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2100



ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER